



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/722,205	11/25/2000	Jamie M. Grooms	RT   -78-1041B	3721
29847 7.	590 09/18/2002			
VAN DYKE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.			EXAMINER	
1630 HILLCREST STREET			ROBERT, EDUARDO C	
ORLANDO, FL 32803				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		SFP 2 4 2002	3732	
		SEP DI Zum	DATE MAILED: 09/18/2002	2
		שורות		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

OCT 1 2002

RESPONSE DUE:

Office Action Summary  Og/722,205  GROOMS ET AL  Examiner  Art Unit					
Office Action Summary					
Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit					
Eduardo C. Robert 3732					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence add Period for Reply	ress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	nmunication.				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	2				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	50				
8) Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).					
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/722,205

Art Unit: 3732

## DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-28 and 32, drawn to a spinal spacer, classified in class 623, subclass
   17.16.
- II. Claims 29 and 30, drawn to a method of making at least one implant, classified in class 606, subclass 79.
- III. Claim 31, drawn to a method for inducing fusion of cervical vertebrae, classified in class 606, subclass 61.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claim can be made by another process, e.g. one wherein the core cutter does not include a central drill bit and/or one wherein the implant is formed having a square or rectangular shape.

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as

Art Unit: 3732

claimed can be practice with an implant of cortical bone which having planes that are not parallel to each other.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different methods are not capable of use together and they have different functions and effects, i.e. Invention II is for making at least one implant and Invention III is for inducing fusion of cervical vertebrae.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II and III is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- I. Figures 1a-1b
- Figures 1c-1e II.
- III. Figures 6a-6c
- IV. Figures 6d-6f
- V.
- Figures 6g-6i VI. Figure 7a
- VII. Figure 8a
- VIII. Figures 8d-8g
- Figures 12a-12d IX.
- X. Figures 13a-13f
- XI. Figures 14a-14d
- Figures 15a-15f XII.

Art Unit: 3732

XIII. Figures 16a-16d XIV. Figures 17a-17f

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eduardo C. Robert whose telephone number is 703-305-7333. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 703-308-2698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

Eduardo C. Robert Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

E.C. Robert September 13, 2002